



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,599	01/20/2004	Stephen R. Van Doren	200313613-1	1105
22879 7590 12/16/2009 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528				
EXAMINER				
CHERY, MARDOCHIEE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2186				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/16/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

laura.m.clark@hp.com

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/760,599</p>	<p>Applicant(s) VAN DOREN ET AL.</p>
	<p>Examiner MARDOCHEE CHERY</p>	<p>Art Unit 2186</p>

All Participants:

(1) MARDOCHEE CHERY (Examiner).

(2) Steven Webb (44,395).

Date of Interview: 2 December 2009

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 1:00 PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

September 29, 2009 decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Claims discussed:

2-4, 7, 9-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24-26, 29 and 30

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner was not successful in an attempt to amend the Independent claims to incorporate possible allowable claims as shown in the Board's decision of September 29, 2009. Examiner argued that incorporating claim 17 into claim 16 would not make claim 16 allowable based on newly discovered prior art, however, the Attorney of record disagreed.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Mardochee Chery/
Examiner, Art Unit 2188

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)